



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,248	11/03/2003	Guy Storer	920190-95021	3778

23644 7590 03/14/2007
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
P.O. BOX 2786
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

BLUDAU, BRANDON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/700,248	Applicant(s) STORER ET AL.	
	Examiner Brandon S. Bludau	Art Unit 2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-3 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims sue the verb of "allowing", this is a passive verb, thus it necessarily doesn't require a specific action, thus any system that doesn't specifically preclude the desired result may effectively allow the action. The Examiner suggests amending claim 1 to read, "enabling" and claims 2 and 3 to read, "requiring". Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 1 should read "a method of operating a computer system..." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-^{are}7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Limsico (US Patent 6662228) and further in view of Mohammed et al (US Patent 6973482).

4. As per claim 1, Limsico discloses a computer system comprising a first network connected to a plurality of further networks,

(a) the first network including a plurality of client computers and a first server computer, having log-on software for allowing a user at any one of the client computers to log on to the first server computer,

(b) the further networks having respective firewalls, the first server computer having permission to access the further networks through their respective firewalls (column 6 lines 42-48),

(c) each of the further networks including a further server computer having log-on software for allowing a user currently logged on at the first server computer also to log on to the further server computer through the first server computer (column 5 lines 17-28 and column 6 line 28-column 7 line 14).

Limsico does not specifically disclose the system comprising the further server computer including terminal server software for enabling a remote desktop session to be run on the further server computer from any of the client computers, thereby allowing a user at any of the client computers to remotely run application software in the further server computer. The examiner notes that the administrator does have access to areas or routines of the server or administered network, while specific examples include account creation or deletion, it may be understood that a network administrator may necessarily be able to run a remote desktop session on the server as is commonly performed in the art and would have been well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Moreover, the Examiner brings in Mohammed to demonstrate the common practices of an administrator gaining remote desktop access for a user computer (see background and summary). The Examiner acknowledges the differences in the art pertaining to the method of gaining access, but wishes to point out that there are numerous authentication techniques available for authenticating access, and believes it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to implement the

Art Unit: 2132

embodiment of Limsico wherein the request for access to the server includes capability of establishing a remote desktop session as would be desirable for the features discussed in the background of Mohammed. Therefore it would have been obvious and desirable for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Limsico to include wherein the step of gaining access to the server computer included the ability to establish a remote desktop session on the server computer. Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Limsico would be to enable the network administrator to perform the functions of the administrator discussed in Mohammed such as providing remote assistance to the computer (see background).

5. As per claim 2, Limsico discloses a system according to claim 1 wherein, after the user has logged on to the first server computer, the first server computer presents the user with a list of the further networks that the user is permitted to access, allowing the user to select only from that list (see column 6 lines 32 –43). The Examiner argues that the subtle differences such as presenting a list of further networks versus checking a list of further networks would necessarily be an obvious modification if not a simple design choice since the differences in the functionality are negligible, as should be easily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

6. As per claim 3, Limsico in view of Mohammed disclose a system according to claim 2 wherein, after the user has logged on to the further server computer, the further server computer presents the user with a list of application programs that the user is permitted to launch, allowing the user to select only from that list (Limsico column 7 lines 8-14, The Examiner points to the argument of design choice above and further

notes that providing a list of accessible applications is a mere design choice over checking for access rights of the administrator based on a list. In addition, Mohammed describes the administrator performing a login on the client with minimal privileges, thus implying some list of applications or actions that may be performed by the administrator (see column 7 line 45-47).

7. As per claim 4, Limsico discloses a system according to claim 1 wherein the first network is connected to the further networks by way of the Internet (column 7 lines 44-45).

8. As per claim 5, Limsico in view of Mohammed discloses a system according to claim 1 wherein the first network is an IT support service provider's network, and each of the further networks is a customer's network (Mohammed see background).

9. As per claim 6, Limsico in view of Mohammed discloses a system according to claim 5 wherein the application software in the further server computer comprises support software for remotely diagnosing and repairing faults on a customer's network (see Mohammed column 6 lines 55-60).

10. As per claim 7, Limsico in view of Mohammed discloses a method of operating computer system comprising a first network connected to a plurality of further networks, the first network including a plurality of client computers and a first server computer, and each of the further networks comprising a firewall and a further server computer, the method comprising:

(a) providing the first server computer with permission to access the further networks through their respective firewalls;

Art Unit: 2132

(b) logging on a user at any one of the client computers to the first server computer;

(c) after the user is logged on to the first server computer, logging that user on to the further server computer through the first server computer, and

(d) enabling a user at any of the client computers to remotely run application software in the further server computer, by way of a remote desktop session wherein the further server computer receives user input from (and returns display updates to) the client computer via the first server. The examiner points to the rejection to claim 1 as it is directed to a system performing a substantially similar method. The Examiner notes that the step of providing the first server computer with permission to access the further networks is an implied embodiment of Limsico. Limsico doesn't disclose the particular step, however the first server is able to access the further servers, thus there must be an implied permission.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lutz (US PgPub 2003/0204579) and Tran (US Patent 6,505,238).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Bludau whose telephone number is 571-272-3722. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2132

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BB

Brandon S Bludau
Examiner
Art Unit 2132


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100